

USSN. 09/742,560
 Examiner: YIP, WINNIE S
 Group A.U.: 3637
 December 30, 2004

Remarks

It is observed that the Examiner rejected claims 38, 40-41, 43-45, 47-48, 50, 52-57, 59, 61-62, 64 and 66 as being anticipated by or, in alternative as obvious over EP 381,000.

Claims 38-43, 45, 47-48, 50, 52-56, 59, 61-62, 64 and 66 were instead rejected as being unpatentable over Seach (WO 93/12303) in view of Menendez (US-6,698,155).

The Applicant observes that the EP document is just the document that was cited in the application by the applicant and thus the applicant was well aware of such document, also due to the fact that it is assigned to the same assignee of the present invention.

When the applicant deals with prior art in the introductory portion of the specification of the present invention the EP document is mentioned and its drawbacks are highlighted.

The present invention aims at improving the bonding of the reinforcement to the concrete and in particular aims at improving just the reinforcement of the EP document.

It is to be observed that all the prior art reinforcement (included the reinforcement of the EP document) are subjected to decohesion when the reinforcement is embedded in the concrete.

The EP document partially solves this problem by providing perforations on the faces of the profiles that compose the reinforcement, through which the concrete, during the manufacture of the panel, can pass, firmly anchoring the reinforcement in the panel body.

However, notwithstanding the presence of such perforations, and the fact that the profiles are connected together to form a frame, decohesion is still susceptible to occur.

USSN. 09/742,560
 Examiner: YIP, WINNIE S
 Group A.U.: 3637
 December 30, 2004

With the above problem in mind, the inventors of the present application found that adding undulations to the perforations greatly increases cohesion of the reinforcement inside the panel body, thus fulfilling the aim of the invention.

The undulations and the perforations are arranged on different planes and this helps to increase cohesion of the reinforcement to the concrete since the continuity of the profiles is interrupted and the planar profile of the faces of the profile is altered.

None of the prior art documents disclose such an arrangement of perforations and undulations in order to interrupt the continuity of the profile, altering the planar profile of the faces of the profile.

The EP document discloses only perforations and not the combination of perforations and undulations as claimed in herewith amended claims 38 and 53.

In the same way, WO93/1230 discloses a profile that due to its shape cannot be connected to another profile of the same type to build a frame as claimed in the present claims 38 and 53.

In fact, the profile of WO document, with regard both to figures 1 and 4-5, does not disclose a profile having a shape adapted to be connected with another profile; the reinforcement of the WO document is made of a single profile and the undulations are not arranged at the end of the parallel wings, so as to face one another.

Still further, no combination of perforations and undulations is disclosed in the WO reference.

The teachings of Menendez would not add nothing relevant to the teachings of the WO reference.

USSN. 09/742,560
Examiner: YIP, WINNIE S
Group A.U.: 3637
December 30, 2004

Summarizing, the applicant's claimed invention, as claimed in claim 38 provides the following distinctive features:

- the shape of the single profile is such as to allow connection of a plurality of profiles together, so as to manufacture a sort of frame to be used as reinforcement;
- the profile has both perforations and undulations;
- the undulations are arranged at portions of the profile so as to face one another;
- the undulations and perforations are arranged on different planes.

In view of the above, it is believed that independent claims 38 and 53 are in an allowable condition.

The application is thus believed to be in order for acceptance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly define the present invention and distinguish the same over the art of record, applicant would be open to any suggestion the Examiner may have concerning different claim phraseology which, in the Examiner's opinion, more accurately defines the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,



Guido MODIANO (Reg. No. 19,928)

Agent for the Applicant

Via Meravigli 16

20123 MILAN-ITALY

Tel. +39 02 8590.7777

Milan: December 30, 2004